

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application. With the present response, Applicants have corrected typographical error in the specification and have amended claim 1 and cancelled claim 2. No new matter is added by virtue of these claim amendments.

It is noted that claim 1 has been objected to as missing a period. As part of the amendment of claim 1, a period has been added.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. 2002/0109472 published August 15, 2002 by Kulish, et al. (hereinafter, "Kulish, et al."). With respect to the conductive screening recitation of the claims, the Examiner refers to conductive screening 13 which is shown in Figs. 3-6 and described in paragraphs 0029-0033 and 0077 of Kulish, et al.

Looking to the cited figures and paragraphs of Kulish, et al., it may be seen that conductive screening 13 envelops the entire accelerative block. As noted at Col. 6, lines 66-67, "The whole accelerating block of MLIA 3 is allocated in a metallic screen 13."

Rather than encompassing the entire acceleration block, the present invention provides for "a sequence of linearly connected acceleration sections, each of which, in turn, is made in the form of one or more magnetic inductors, each linearly connected acceleration section being enveloped by a separate conductive screen." Claim 1 also recites "at least one of the separate conductive screens being made in such a manner that it envelops at least two acceleration sections which belong to different one-channel linear induction acceleration blocks."

Fig. 6 of the application illustrates two neighboring acceleration sections with a common conductive screen. With this configuration, each of the magnetic inductors, 6, take part in forming voltage in each acceleration space of the acceleration sections that are enveloped by the common screen. As a result, the voltage acting on particle beams in the acceleration space forms as a sum of the voltages generated by all inductors within the common screen. Application, page 9, lines 20-31. This allows an increase in the electric voltage in acceleration spaces of the acceleration sections without increasing the current strength in the inductor windings. In other words, the same voltage can be obtained with lower energy losses for the magnetic core re-magnetizing, which automatically leads to increased efficiency of the accelerator. Application, page 6, lines 6-21. A detailed explanation of the electromagnetic interactions is provided at page 9, line 32 to page 12, line 7.

The conductive screening of the present invention may be provided within either a multi-channel linear induction accelerator (MILINAC) as recited in claim 3 or a multi-channel induction

Appln. No. 10/797,380
Amendment dated August 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2005

undulative accelerator (MIUNAC) as recited in claim 4. These claims should be considered patentable for the reasons given above in connection with claim 1.

In view of the foregoing remarks, wherein the claim program is seen to readily distinguish over the references, Applicants earnestly solicit issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 24, 2005

Diane E. Burke

Diane E. Burke
Reg. No. 45,725
MUELLER AND SMITH, L.P.A.
Mueller-Smith Building
7700 Rivers Edge Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43235-1355
Tel.: 614-436-0600
Fax: 614-436-0057
email: dburke@muellersmith.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on August 24, 2005 with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Jane Keeney
Jane Keeney